

Slaves in the British Empire, precludes other nations from now meeting us with the reproach, Physician heal thyself; and arms us with a moral influence, for the use of which we are solemnly responsible. It is true our Colonial negroes are not wholly free, but wherein our example is here deficient, our experience is the more admonitory, and we can assure all whom the assurance may reach, that our Emancipation Act has wrought well in all but its qualifications—that in Antigua and the Bermuda, where the boon of freedom was bestowed, unmodified, all is contentment and comparative prosperity; and that as the result of the whole, we desire all expatriated Africans to be as our's now are, excepting their Apprenticeship.

The ample and accurate intelligence now possessed, as to the state of American Society, likewise augments the obligation to exert ourselves for its amendment. We knew there were Slaves in the United States, but we did not know till lately that nearly two millions and a half of the inhabitants are in a State of Slavery. We knew that people of color, even though free, were regarded with prejudice, but we did not know that they are subjected to a ceaseless and systematized ignominy from which the sanctuary itself, and even the table of the Lord, afford them no retreat or protection. It was matter of notoriety that Abolitionists in America, shared the jealousy of all magnanimous philanthropists; but the threatenings and slaughters breathed out against them by the periodical press, by ministers and magistrates, Presbyteries and States, have incalculably exceeded our darkest suspicions, and filled us not less with astonishment than abhorrence.

But what have you to do with us, our American brethren may ask? Why, being foreigners, intermeddle with our domestic institutions? And what have you to do, we reply, with the heathen nations, to whom, on a scale so magnificent, you are sending devoted, undaunted, Missionaries? Why molest their household economy, by aspersing their household gods? Is it alleged that the cases are different? Our reply is—the same word which condemns idols, condemns instruments of cruelty, and furnishes the maxim alike applicable to both:—Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him. The cavalier, however, is so weak, as to be unworthy of refutation. Were we reasoning with idolaters who say, keep your gods and we shall keep ours, we might patiently expound our conviction that there is but one true God, and one true religion, and plead the consequent necessity laid upon us, to press the universal adoption of that faith and fulfillment of that law, which alone we account divine, and acceptable, and saving. But how can we composedly dilate on these first principles of the oracles of God to American Christians, who are at the very moment prosecuting efforts of glorious aggressive benevolence? Such works are to us more expressive than words, and adopting the former as our model, in preference to the latter, we shall extend the same fidelity to America as America to other nations.

Will you not, esteemed Christian friends, aid us in this work and labor of love?—Think what is due to the gospel of Jesus, which Slavery in all its forms obstructs, outrages and defiles. Consider what we owe to the subjugated, and even when liberated, still abused negro. Suppose him all that malice would pronounce him, are we not equally with an apostle, made debtors to the Barbarians as well as to the Greeks, by that holy religion, which proclaims God to have made of one blood all nations that dwell on the face of the earth, which enjoins to loose the bands of wickedness—to undo the heavy burdens—to let the oppressed go free—to break every yoke; and whose comprehensive commission, as delivered by a once crucified, but then risen Redeemer, is—Go into all the world, & preach the gospel to every creature? But many of these stolen, enslaved, insulted strangers, are accredited followers of the Lamb of God. They are not merely bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, but members of that one whole family, that is named in Christ, bought with the same blood as ourselves, sanctified by the same spirit, crying on the same footing of adoption, Abba Father. How then shall we behold unmoved, the anguish of their souls, and not be verily guilty concerning our brethren? How shall we hear of their cruel bondage, and imagine while acting, as if we knew it not, that we are remembering those who are in bonds as bound with them, and them that suffer adversity as being ourselves also in the body?

Think what claims the Emancipations of America have on our resolute co-agency. Among these are to be found some of the noblest spirits of the age—the brightest examples of humanity and religion. In naming some, we may be wronging others, but these will be most readily excuse us, for instancing Lund, Garrison, Tappan, Birney, Cox and Jay—men who have not only engaged their superior powers, and not only sacrificed their time and their property, but braved a hurricane of obloquy and danger, placing life itself in jeopardy to effect the liberation of the oppressed African. Our efficient interposition would strengthen the hands and gladden the hearts of such men—would enhance the credit of the undertaking with their countrymen increase the number of its supporters, enfeeble the hostility of its opponents, and every way hasten their ultimate victory. What, then, are all our lauded principles—what our high-sounding professions, if we deny to such benefactors a fraternal alliance at once so easy to us and precious to them. At the same time to be precious it must be immediate. One year hence, these regenerators of their country may less need our assistance. In a few years hence their names will certainly be honored by the very classes who now create them. But if they live to see the effect of their exertions in this transformation of public opinion, they will look back from amid the admiring mid-day throng to remember and acknowledge those earliest allies who first joined their imperiled standard, helping them when they needed help, approving and supporting them while yet vilified and assailed.

In a word, reflect what is duty to the slaveholders themselves. Are they not objects of Christian philanthropy, the victims of a bondage so much worse than that which they inflict as voluntary sin is more dreadful than involuntary suffering. It is true they may diabolize our expostulation, but the more it is disliked the more it is needed, and to wink at the offence is to contract its guilt.

In whatever light, then, we contemplate the subject, it imperatively requires us to be up and doing. There is no escape from the responsibility. The opinion of this country will be estimated by its expression, and

wherever it is not expressed, silence will be construed into consent. Such a construction would be, indeed, utterly groundless.—There are some who deplore, and others who deride, and a few it may be who palliate, but who are they of our population that defend the Slavery of America? If any speak of gradual cure it is not so much as being necessary to the negro, a dogma which the recent history of our colonies has signally exploded, but to the masters, who cannot be expected, it seems, to act righteously all on a sudden, after being so long habituated to extreme unrighteousness, and must needs themselves go through an apprenticeship to prepare them for doing justly and loving mercy! This is the highest pleading proffered in our country to transatlantic Slavery. And will high-minded America accept of this vindication? It cannot be, & next, therefore, to earnest remonstrance, we desire nothing more earnestly than a publication of this defence from our neutrals of their non-interference; for, if such be the vindication of America, what is its condemnation? If any, however, be speechless, their taciturnity will be misconstrued, and all, therefore, who do not interpose to discover, are powerfully, though indirectly, confirming the delusion of the oppressor and the calamities of the oppressed. The question then, is not whether we shall be actionless, but whether we shall do good or evil; not whether we shall take a side, but which side we shall take; for, whosoever in this cause is not with Christ, is against him, and he who gathereth not with him, scattereth. Surely Christians cannot waver between these alternatives. They came to a decision in relation to our own colonies, and how glorious is the result! As a political question, the abolition of slavery had been agitated for half a century in vain, the strongest arguments from expediency achieving no perceptible advancement; but, no sooner was it discussed as a religious question, than the mountains were levelled and the valleys filled before the resistless march of Christian principle. How animating is the encouragement afforded by this success. And let it not be said that the influence so availing here is insusceptible of extension to foreign shores. Were we reasoning on merely civil grounds, we might be told of the difference of civil condition; but we argue on spiritual grounds, and derive our arguments from that Word which owns no distinction of kindred or of clime.

Already our Christian influence with America has been tested and established.—What good has been already effected by Mr Geo. Thompson, our eloquent and devoted deputy? Once we sent thousands to subjugate America, and with all the prowess of British arms and courage, and tactics, they failed in the enterprise. More recently we sent one combatant, and him unarmed, to liberate America's oppressed millions by speaking the truth. And what has been the result? He has fled. Yes, as Paul fled from Iconium and Lystra, to escape the jealousy and hatred consequent upon conquest. He has retreated, leaving behind him nearly 1300 immediate abolition societies, in great part the fruit of his benevolent mission. Were Britain then to exert fully its moral power, or rather by undivided fidelity to call down the full blessing from on High, American Slavery, we are free to anticipate, could not withstand the onset.—Let Ministers, and Elders, and Deacons, exert their appropriate influence with the flocks of which they are the responsible overseers. Let the several churches and ecclesiastical courts and congregational unions proclaim, in affectionate but faithful accents, their deep and painful and universal impression of America's blameworthiness.—These means, though simple, are invincible—they must prevail.

Before the first shock of weapons, not carnal, wielded by a mighty and united people, the surest strong hold of oppression, will rend, and shake, and fall. And when Slavery expires in America where shall it survive? With such desertion from its ranks and accession to its assailants, where and by what resources shall it maintain its ground? We are bold to reply, nowhere and nowhere.—The battle now fought in Columbia decides for the world. All nations, accounting it final, look on with generous hope or interested fear, and when victory declares, as it shall declare, so surely as God is true, for the friends of injured humanity, all the ends of the earth must speedily participate in the joyful consummation—transcendent jubilee, inferior only to that which it shall accompany and promote, the admission of all the family of the earth into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

* The services of Captain Stuart deserve also to be acknowledged as most judicious and valuable. † There are now above 400.

THE TELEGRAPH.

JUNE 16.

BIBLE SOCIETY.—The readers of the Telegraph have before been informed that the Rubicon was passed—that the American Bible Society, at its late annual meeting in N. York, confirmed the decision of its Board of Managers respecting foreign translations—and that immediately on this event an American and Foreign Society was formed, with a view to extend and facilitate the circulation of the translated Word.

The proceedings of the convention, and the addresses to the churches are given on the 1st page of to-day's Telegraph. From the American Baptist it appears that there is more than \$2000, already in treasury. How much shall be raised in Vermont, this year, to carry the Lamp of Life to those who are groping and perishing in the shadow of death? "What thou doest, do quickly."—Whatever is done now is worth incalculably more than the same done at any future period. Take an illustration: Plant a handful of corn this year; suppose it to produce a hundred-fold; plant all of that next year, and suppose it to produce in the same ratio; now how much more will you have at the end of the second year than if you had kept the handful over the first year before you had planted it? Carry the calculation forward through a number of years, and estimate who can, the loss of one year's delay at the outset. So in moral or religious enterprise: A Bible, a tract, a sermon or address, given now, may, during the year, bring in, to aid the enterprise, ten-fold its own power.

er. A certain benevolent national Society, during the past year, employed an agent a few months, in one of the New-England States. At the close of the agency a State Society was formed auxiliary to the parent institution, and \$2000 were pledged on the spot in support of the cause during the coming year. Here is not only two thousand dollars obtained by the expenditure of as many hundred—for the employment of other agents on other fields, and the distribution of publications—but a mighty moral influence is acquired, which is extending itself in every direction.

Brethren, the time has fully come for action. The loss of delay is incalculable.—Look at the field open before us. Listen to the cries of those who are starving for lack of the bread of life. Remember the cattle are the Lord's—the gold and the silver are the Lord's—the souls to be saved are the Lord's—and ye are the Lord's accountable stewards.

For the Telegraph.

MR EDITOR:

I regard it no more than Christian courtesy, in the discussion of important religious subjects, to give every man an opportunity to make himself fully understood. And when any important point is assumed without proof, I deem it but just to the cause of truth, to ourselves, and to him who assumes the point, to ask for, and to give him a fair opportunity to give him a fair opportunity to show us the evidence on which his position rests.

With these views, I am not convinced that the proposition of certain questions to Daleth, in your paper of May 25, was impertinent, or any departure from those rules which should guide brethren in a candid research after divine truth.

In the review of the article on atonement, Daleth states that a certain sentiment advocated in the essay, had been advanced by Taylor and Socinius. M. was not previously aware of this fact; and as no reference was made even to the books containing the sentiment, he candidly asks where the passages may be found.

The reviewer "undertakes to show a difference between reconciliation and atonement" and redemption, without defining the first or the last of these terms; and afterwards quotes Scriptures containing these terms, in such a way as to leave M. in perfect doubt of the sense which he attaches to them; and M. asks to be informed.

Again, Daleth reasons from the type to the antitype, in a manner which makes it appear to M. that Daleth's views of a type must be somewhat different from his own, otherwise he cannot see the correctness of his conclusions; and he would be happy to know where and what the point of difference is, lest if he should dissent from what he may suppose the sense of the reviewer to be, he might be found beating the air.

Again, Daleth informs us that "in the ritual law, reconciliation, pardon of sins, and atonement, were the same things.—But in the new dispensation we have shown, (he says,) that there is a difference. Now M. was not apprized that these terms were used differently in the new dispensation from what they had been in the old, or that in the old they meant the same thing; and earnestly desiring to know the truth, he asked to be referred to the passages which teach the doctrine.—"No man lighteth a candle and putteth it under a bushel." M. would most thankfully have acknowledged the aid of Daleth's light, had he been permitted to walk by it in search of truth on these points.

Now, if we have no point to carry, but our object is simply to elicit and sustain the truth; and if, as we ought not, we have no pride of judgment that prompts us, having expressed an opinion, with undue anxiety to sustain it, I do not see why we should not afford to each other, as inquirers after truth, all the helps in our power. M. would gladly afford Daleth all the aid in his power, if by that means the essay should pass through an ordeal seven-fold more rigorous, and in the end its positions be proved, to the full satisfaction of the writer & of every body else, to be founded in error. But he has no wish to press any inquiries which may seem to Daleth impertinent, or in the least unkind. He will, by divine permission, take time and carefully examine the points assumed by Daleth, and trusts he shall do it not in the spirit of an antagonist, but in that of a fellow student in the school of Christ.

Mr Editor—I understand you to say that the columns of the Telegraph are open for a reply to Daleth; but you decline publishing the essay, unless the essay itself shall be considered a reply to its reviewer. All that M. desires is that the subject may be fairly placed before the present readers of the Telegraph. The re-written article could be no more a reply to Daleth than the original one; as the alterations consist principally in the omission of some repetitions, the correction of some verbal inaccuracies, and an improvement of the style. You say, "If the second edition is to appear, we see no need of a re-publication of the first." (1.)—If it appears in the Telegraph, there will be no need of it, but if it appears in the Christian Review but very few of your readers will be any the better informed in consequence of it. M. can see no way in which your readers can be enabled to judge of the merits of the cause but by republishing the essay, or at least the principal part of it. And he thinks the cause of truth requires that some strictures should be made on the review and would be happy to make them, and as briefly as the nature of the case will permit, but he must abide the decisions of the Editor. (2.)

(1.) By recurring to the whole paragraph from which the quotation is made,

"If the second edition &c."—M. will discover that it is there promised that the re-written article shall appear "in the Telegraph," if he prefers it to the original essay or any thing else that may be specially prepared in reply to Daleth. If M. prefers the original essay, and will furnish it—very well—no objection—only it seemed that there was not need of both.

(2.) Before brother M. gave the unkind cut—"but he must abide the decisions of the editor"—he should have read with more carefulness the paragraph already alluded to—which may be found near the middle of the 143d page of the Telegraph—and he would have seen that "the columns of the Telegraph are open," either for the "re-written article," or for a reply to the review in other shape. The Editor has sins enough heaped upon his head from every quarter by the malicious, without their being augmented carelessly by a beloved brother. The most painful duty the Editor has yet performed, during his short career, has been the rejection of divers articles offered for the Telegraph, for he well knew that the rejection would give pain to those who were disappointed; but when he placed duty and the public good over against private feelings, the former preponderated. In the instance in which he incurred the strongest censure from individuals, his conscience yet approves the course taken, and he is now fully satisfied that he is sustained in that course by four fifths of his readers. He cannot expect that all his decisions will be right; nevertheless decision there must be, and he fervently hopes that it may always be with some degree of candor, impartiality and prayer. "Who is sufficient for these things?"

In another part of our paper we have inserted the speeches of Gerrit Smith Esq. and Rev. Mr. Galusha, before the American Anti-Slavery Society at its late anniversary meeting. We need not inform our readers that publishing the doings of a society, does not imply approbation of its plan or measures. Our own views of Anti-Slavery Societies have been repeatedly expressed, and we have seen no occasion to alter them. We believe that the formation of these societies at the North is calculated rather to retard than hasten the happy termination of slavery at the South. We believe that but for the injudicious meddling of Northern Anti-Slavery men with the matter, the cause of emancipation would have made great progress, ere this, in Maryland, Virginia and Kentucky.—[New-York Observer.]

REMARKS.

And what were these slaveholding States doing towards emancipation when the present anti-slavery movement commenced at the North? Just what they had been doing for half a century—"letting the matter alone"—except what was worse, they were "providing and keeping open a drain for the excess of increase beyond the occasions of profitable employment." And what was being done at the North to convince them of their sin, to show them their folly, or to warn them of their danger? Nothing—everything done here tended to quell their fears and quiet their consciences; it was only helping them to construct and work their safety-valve. They were not taught that slavery was sinful. The sympathy was for the oppressor, more than for the oppressed. Northern men by scores and hundreds were flocking to the slaveholding regions and taking up the traffic. Those who uttered a word, by way of fixing on a time for universal emancipation, put it off for at least a century, thus leaving the labor for after generations.

Such was the state of things when "the meddling of Northern Anti-Slavery men with the matter" commenced. Now look at the fruits of their doings. In the first place, take naked facts. Theodore D. Weld, an agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, who has lately been lecturing with great success in the State of Ohio, has now in his possession the names of men in the slaveholding states who have lately emancipated 450 slaves, as the result of this "meddling" complained of.—While Mr Weld was in Pittsburgh, at the close of a public lecture, a man rushed through the crowd, seized him by the arm, took him aside, and said to him, "I am a Maryland Slaveholder. Being in the place and hearing that there was to be an anti-slavery address, I was anxious to hear it. I have heard you; and now I want to say to you, go on. Preach anti-slavery at the North. Preach it wherever you can. Circulate your publications. We shall get them. We do get them.—There are more than a hundred slaveholders in Maryland who sympathize with you, and will come out and be with you as soon as they dare to. Go on—go on." This man urged upon Mr Weld—what agrees with sound philosophy and all ex-

perience—the propriety and necessity of carrying on the work at the North. Another fact: A Southern slaveholder who attended the late meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society in New-York, after the meeting, went into the Anti-Slavery office and made himself known as a slaveholder. One of the agents of the society asked him: Do you think, sir, after attending our meeting, that we are sane men? Yes, was the reply. Do you think we are honest? Yes, and I do not know but you are right. After further conversation, he purchased a file of the society's documents to carry home with him.

Facts of this sort are now coming to light every day. But all of them that have yet been told do not show a tenth part of a tithe of what has been done. Philanthropy is beginning to awake. The Bible is being defended against the blasphemy that it justifies oppression. Ministers are preaching. The church is praying. God Almighty is thundering through his own chosen organs. Satan's hosts are manifesting discomfiture. Aristocracy is quailing. Despotism turns pale. A moral earthquake is shaking the nation, and it shall not cease until Babel is razed to the foundation and trodden in the dust. Let those who stand in the way beware lest they be buried in the ruins.

NEW-ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

The N. E. Anti-Slavery Convention was held in this city last week. We could not attend so constantly as to give a fair account of it, and therefore did not visit it at all. The common opinion among those whom we have heard speak of it, is, that nobody was very well satisfied with it. (1.)—Perhaps, however, they are all prejudiced—though some of them belong to the Anti-Slavery Society. (2.) Money was raised—not in cash or collectible obligations, but in promises to endeavor to get subscriptions and donations—to the amount of about \$8000, for the expenses of the year. (3.) If mobs and Lynching go on another year, they will raise it easily. (4.) By their aid, the Am. A. S. Society last year raised \$25,000 out of the \$30,000 voted at N. York. (5.)

Some of the most respectable Abolitionists talk of the necessity of taking the cause out of the hands of the present leaders, and giving its management a better character.—This would doubtless secure the co-operation of many, who now stand aloof. Perhaps it will be done; but we see no prospect of it. (6.)—Recorder.

"The only true church."—The following resolution was moved by Mr Charles Stuart (formerly of the British army) (7.) and seconded by the Rev. O. S. Murray, editor of the Vermont Telegraph:

Resolved, That when the church becomes so corrupt as to use its influence to delay and prevent the fulfillment of the will of Christ respecting righteousness, peace, purity and temperance, it becomes necessary for those who love and reverence the gospel, to associate themselves anew for the support of these its fundamental principles; and that such associations are the true and only church of Christ.

This resolution evidently means something that it does not express. Slavery was the subject under consideration; and the framers of the resolution doubtless meant to say that anti-slavery churches are the only true churches. They should have had the courage to say so plainly. (8.) It was reported, if we understand the account by the standing committee, consisting of S. J. May, David Root, W. L. Garrison, Theodore S. Wright, Ira M. Bidwell, John C. Whitier, Eliza W. Follen &c. The gentlemen composing this committee therefore, as well as Messrs Stuart and Murray, are understood to have approved of *unchurching* all but the adherents of Garrisonism. The convention, however, could not quite go it. The resolution was re-committed, and the following substitute adopted: (10.)

Resolved, That the countenance given to slavery by the participation and apologies of the principal preachers of the Christian church, has been more effectual for its support than any other cause; nor can we look for its abolition till the church is purified from this sin.

Vt. Chronicle.

NOTES.

(1.) "Nobody very well satisfied with it." As Mr Tracy "did not visit it at all," who has he "heard speak of it?" Has he heard the Boston Daily Advocate, which has the ablest, most independent and impartial editor or any political paper in Boston, who visited the convention daily, and semi-daily, throughout the session. Hear him. Of the first day he says:

"The New-England Anti-Slavery Convention assembled yesterday, in Rev. Mr. Blagden's Church, in Salem-street, in this city. That spacious building was entirely occupied, by as respectable, attentive, and as truly moral and religious an assembly as any public occasion has ever called together in this city. A most respectable and deeply absorbed attention pervaded the audience."

So entirely composed and so fully open to free discussion, were the members of this respectable Convention, that we warrant they would have listened, most patiently, to an address from Gov. M'Duffie, showing that slavery was indispensable to liberty, provided he would wait for an answer. The liberties, morals, and religion of our country can ever be in danger in the hands of such men and women as composed the Convention and its friends.—There was not the slightest indication of disapprobation from any quarter. *

Extracts from his remarks on the second day's session:

The discussion in the Convention yesterday, were highly animated, and elicited strong bursts of eloquence with cogent argument. We doubt if any of the Anniversary assemblies of the week have brought out so much talent.

Of the third day: In the afternoon, a great number of resolu-

tions were offered, on various subjects, and all passed unanimously, after animated discussions.

The business of the Convention having been disposed of, an impressive prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Grosvenor, and a hymn sung, after which the Convention was dissolved, at half past 6 o'clock, having been in active session three days. *

We thank our fellow citizens of the Convention for their firmness and moral courage in thus sustaining this fundamental principle of Liberty—the right of free discussion.

Says the editor of the Lynn Record:

It was one of the most affecting and deeply interesting meetings we ever attended.—If anything is calculated to dispel the gloom which is hovering over the liberties of our country, portending its speedy downfall, it is the glowing patriotism, the thrilling, soul-stirring eloquence of the talented young men who are now coming upon the stage of life. Not all the corruptions of wealth, of aristocracy, of Pharisaical priestcraft, of the despotism of slavery itself, can restrain the ardor, or suppress the flow of generous feeling, which bursts from the hearts of these devoted young men. *

The audience were, in their appearance, generally intelligent and respectable. A large number of ladies were present.

We wish the whole American people, especially those in Congress assembled, could have been present and heard the addresses on this occasion.

Has Mr Tracy heard any of the above—or anything of similar language from a score of other papers? Does he know that Mr Blagden's meeting-house, where the Convention was held, was so filled that the broad aisle was frequently crowded with persons standing, in session hours, to the last? Does he know that the friends and attendants of other meetings complained seriously of their numbers scattering off to the Anti-Slavery Convention? This we heard with our own ears at the time. It is doubtless true that the friends of the "American Union," and expatriation—that all the aristocracy—all who hate the Anti-Slavery cause—all who envy Anti-Slavery men—were not "well satisfied" with the triumphant success of the Convention. But that is no warrant for the conclusion that "nobody was very well satisfied with it." Such a representation is a most glaring misrepresentation.

(2.) Who? Doubtless our cause, as well as almost every other good cause, has those who at times are faint hearted and ready to deny—there need however be no uneasiness until something appears more specific and candid.

(3.) The Anti-Slavery Society wants no other "collectible obligations" than the pledged honor of its members. Will the editor of the Boston Recorder make known wherein this has ever failed? "Money was raised—not in cash" &c.—And yet there was cash paid into the treasury of the Convention, on the spot, to the amount of nearly a thousand dollars!

(4.) Whether Mr Tracy has any new plans in view for sending forth the "mobs," he has not told us. On this point, all is characteristic mysticism. His former course of misrepresentation is failing—the people are looking on. All this may strike some, as severe. But how have mobs been raised against abolitionists? Mainly by the press, misrepresenting their principles and measures. What press has only advocated mobocracy? What one has done worse than to misrepresent? And what one has dealt more largely in misrepresentation, than that under the direction of Joseph Tracy?

(5.) The \$25,000 paid into the treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society, last year, was but a small proportion of what was actually expended in promotion of the cause. Of what was raised in Vermont, not one half went to the parent Institution. The remainder was laid out at home. It is known to have been so in other States, extensively. Will Mr Tracy leave sneering at the funds of the Anti-Slavery Society long enough to exhibit the treasury department of the American Union for the relief and improvement of the colored race?

(6.) Those whom Mr Tracy esteems to be "the most respectable Abolitionists," of course are they who are the nearest sympathizing with him in his unchristian crusade against distinctive abolitionism—otherwise gospel truth on the subject of American slavery—especially against the pioneers of the cause, against whom he has always manifested such bitter and sullen envy. But it seems that he despairs of getting the standard lowered down. Well he may—his present prospect is worse than dubious.

(7.) Did not the editors of the Vermont Chronicle, when they penned this contemptible sneer, know that Charles Stuart is now a regularly licensed Presbyterian minister? They ought to have known it. What can be the object of such allusion, but to prejudice the public mind as much as possible against this their brother in the ministry, just as he is about to leave the State? If they could not find themselves possessed of sufficient Christian candor and common honesty to speak the whole truth and let their readers know the man's present calling, manhood and common decency forbid the wanton lugging in of such an allusion.

But is Charles Stuart the only man who has been a Captain in an army, and afterwards a preacher of the gospel of peace? If he were, the fact would rather be in his favor than against him. Suppose Lewis Cass should now resign his office, and on